(b) and (c) The reference is apparently to the provisions in the disciplinary for Central Government employees. As IDPL has its own Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules, the rules as applicable to the Central Government employyes, are not applicable to employees of IDPL. Rule 32(2)(a) of the CCS (Leave Rules), 1972 is not applicable in the case of unauthorised absence from duty.

(d) Disciplinary proceedings against the concerned employees were completed or concluded or extinguished as the case may be.

(e) Leave is not a matter of right. It is a privilege subject to sanction by the competent authority. Leave is treated as sanctioned upon issuance of an Officer Order to that effect. When an employee is informed that leave has not been sanctioned, it is leave refused. This is the standard procedure followed in IDPL.

Refusal to supply the copy of IDPL rules

1911. SHRI ASHIS SEN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to reply to the Unstarred Question 4598 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 20th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the IDPL management refused to supply the copy of the IDPL Rules (CDA) to the charged employees when they demanded for it before replying to their charge sheets, if so, the reasons therefor;

(b) whether it is a fact that the company deliberately appointed the wrong disciplinary authority in order to gain time so that new impunged rule 30-A should be incorporated in the rules books for summarily proceedings with the reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is a fact that despite contemplated the disciplinary proceedings the management denied even the subsistence allowances as per rule 20 of IDPL, CDA Rules and forced them to face the enquiry without it, if so, the reasons thereof; and

(d) whether IDPL was avoiding conducting enquiries under rule 25 of IDPL, CDA against the said employees, if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) The employees referred to is a former Marketing Executive of IDPL. In the matter of such employees, the management of the company is the authority competent to take a decision. As reported by IDPL, it is not correct that the management refused to supply a copy of the Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules to the said former Marketing Executive.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) The said former Marketing Executive was on unauthorised absence. He was not placed under suspension. He was not entitled to any subsistence allowance.

(d) This is not correct the said employee himself was adopting dilatory tactics to prolong proceedings under Rule 25.

Unauthorised absence from duty

1912. SHRI M. A. BABY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 4598 given in the Rajya Sabha on 20th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether disciplinary procedure in case of unauthorised absence from duty for four days and less than 30 days under Rule 25 of IDPL, CDA Rules was applied on the employees, against whom disciplinary proceedings were instituted:

(b) whether under Rule 20 of IDPL, CDA Rules the employees against whom disciplinory proceedings were pending of contemplated for unauthorised absence, were suspended or not, together with the reasons therefor:

(c) whether it is a fact that the employees were denied all allowances even the subsistence, with the reasons therefor; and